

REMARKS

This Amendment After Final Rejection is submitted in response to the outstanding final Office Action, dated February 17, 2005. Claims 20-25 were added in the Amendment and Response to Office Action dated September 14, 2004. Claims 1 through 25 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. In this response, applicant proposes to amend claims 4-8, 18, and 19. No additional fee is due.

This amendment is submitted pursuant to 37 CFR §1.116 and should be entered. The Amendment places all of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1 through 25, in a form that is believed allowable, and, in any event, in a better form for appeal. It is believed that examination of the pending claims as amended, which are consistent with the previous record herein, will not place any substantial burden on the Examiner.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged Applicants' claim for foreign priority under U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and noted that Applicants have not filed certified copies of the Japanese application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b). The Examiner also objected to claim 19 due to indicated informalities. The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Broomhall et al. (United States Patent Number 6,292,904), rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-14, 16-18, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broomhall et al., and further in view of "Using Paradox 5 for Windows" Special Edition (hereinafter, Paradox), Que, 1994, pp. 133-139 and 526-529, rejected claims 4, 15, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broomhall in view of Paradox, and further in view of Atlas et al. (United States Patent Number 5,848,413). The Examiner indicated that claims 8, 19, and 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Claims 4-8, 18, and 19 have been amended to correct typographical errors.

Priority

The Examiner noted that Applicants have not filed certified copies of the Japanese application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

A certified copy of the Japanese application is submitted herewith.

Formal Objections

Claim 19 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only, and/or, cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim.

5 Claim 19 has been amended to remove the dependency from any other multiple dependent claim and Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 19 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 1-3, 9-14 and 20

Independent claims 1-3 and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as 10 being unpatentable over Broomhall et al., and further in view of Paradox. Independent claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Broomhall et al. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Broomhall teaches that “the sponsor requests the external user’s id, and password --- *form of requesting a delegated application* --- by inputting personal information, such as name, telephone number, etc. 15 into a form.”

Applicants note that Broomhall is directed to “providing secure user account identifiers and passwords to facilitate *sharing by users of data* between a secure internal server and an external server accessible over the Internet.” (See, Abstract; emphasis added.) While Broomhall discloses *sharing data* by providing a user ID and 20 password to a user, Broomhall does not address the issue of *delegating an application* to a *proxy*. The present disclosure teaches that, in the prior art, “a proxy user *submits a non-electronic form on behalf of another user*” and “the proxy user *fills necessary items in the form according to the request from the requester and files the form to a predetermined place*.” (Page 1, second paragraph; emphasis added.) In the context of the present 25 invention, the proxy user submits an electronic form on behalf of another user and fills necessary items in the form according to the request from the requester and files the form to a predetermined place. Broomhall, however, does not disclose or suggest a *proxy* as defined in the present invention, and does not disclose or suggest a proxy that submits an electronic form on behalf of another user and fills necessary items in the form according 30 to the request from the requester.

In addition, the Examiner appears to equate the ID and password assigned by the sponsor with form condition data. The present disclosure, for example, teaches that “a concept that includes form ID for *identifying a specific form uniquely* and *data for identifying such a predetermined form group as a form class*, as well as *data for identifying such a predetermined form as a conditional expression* in which ‘XXX’ is set as the first three digits and a number of 22 or under is set in the lower two digits of the form ID.” (Page 4, last paragraph.) Broomhall, however, does not disclose or suggest *form condition data* as defined in the present invention. Neither Broomhall nor Paradox disclose or suggest a concept that includes form ID for *identifying a specific form uniquely* and *data for identifying such a predetermined form group as a form class*, as well as *data for identifying such a predetermined form as a conditional expression*.

Independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, and 13, as amended, require registering or managing *form condition data* that identifies a form of requesting a *delegated application* and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a *proxy applicant* who is requested for said delegated application respectively. Independent claims 3, 11 and 14 require registering or managing delegation term condition data that identifies a term of requesting a delegated application beforehand so as to be related to application requester specification data that specifies an application requester and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a *proxy applicant* who is requested for said *delegated application*. Independent claim 20 requires *form condition data* that identifies a form of requesting a *delegated application*, and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a *proxy applicant* who is requested for said *delegated application*.

Thus, Broomhall and Paradox, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest registering or managing form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a delegated application and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a *proxy applicant* who is requested for said delegated application respectively, as required by independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, and 13, do not disclose or suggest registering or managing delegation term condition data that identifies a term of requesting a delegated application beforehand so as to be related to application requester specification data that specifies an application requester and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a *proxy applicant* who is requested for said delegated application, as required by

independent claims 3, 11 and 14, and do not disclose or suggest form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a delegated application, and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application, as required by independent claim 20.

5 Additional Cited References

Paradox was also cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of allowing the definition of auxiliary passwords. Applicants note that Paradox does not address the issue of *delegating an application to a proxy*. Paradox also does not disclose or suggest *form condition data as defined in the present invention*.

10 Thus, Paradox does not disclose or suggest registering or managing form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a delegated application and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application respectively, as required by independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, and 13, does not disclose or suggest registering or managing delegation term condition data 15 that identifies a term of requesting a delegated application beforehand so as to be related to application requester specification data that specifies an application requester and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application, as required by independent claims 3, 11 and 14, and does not disclose or suggest form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a delegated 20 application, and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application, as required by independent claim 20.

Atlas et al. was cited by the Examiner for its disclosure of automatically providing completions of form fields. Applicants note that United States Patent Number 5,848,413 (Atlas et al.) and the present patent application were commonly owned at the 25 time of the invention and, since Atlas et al. only qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Atlas et al. does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103 (see, 35 U.S.C. §103(c)). Applicants also note that Atlas does not address the issue of *delegating an application to a proxy*. Atlas also does not disclose or suggest *form condition data as defined in the present invention*.

30 Thus, Atlas et al. do not disclose or suggest registering or managing form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a delegated application and proxy

applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application respectively, as required by independent claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, and 13, do not disclose or suggest registering or managing delegation term condition data that identifies a term of requesting a delegated application beforehand so as to be related to 5 application requester specification data that specifies an application requester and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is requested for said delegated application, as required by independent claims 3, 11 and 14, and do not disclose or suggest form condition data that identifies a form of requesting a delegated application, and proxy applicant specification data that specifies a proxy applicant who is 10 requested for said delegated application, as required by independent claim 20.

Dependent Claims 4-8, 15-19 and 21-25

Dependent claims 5-7, 16-18, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broomhall et al., and further in view of Paradox, and 15 claims 4, 15, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broomhall in view of Paradox, and further in view of Atlas et al.

Claims 4-8, 15-19, and 21-25 are dependent on claims 1-3, 12-14, and 20, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Broomhall et al., Paradox, and Atlas et al. (alone or in any combination) because of their dependency from independent claims 1-3, 12-14, and 20 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other 20 elements these claims add in combination to their base claim. The Examiner has already indicated that claims 8, 19, and 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-25, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

25 If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin M. Mason

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

5 Date: April 18, 2005

10